arXiv:1510.04144v1 [math.GR] 14 Oct 2015

ZARISKI CLOSURES AND SUBGROUP SEPARABILITY

LARSEN LOUDER, D. B. MCREYNOLDS, AND PRIYAM PATEL

ABSTRACT. The main result of this article is a refinement of the well-known subgroup separability results of Hall and Scott for free and surface groups. We show that for any finitely generated subgroup, there is a finite dimensional representation of the free or surface group that separates the subgroup in the induced Zariski topology. One consequence of this result is a polynomial upper bound on the size of the quotients used to separate a finitely generated subgroup in a free or surface group.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a finitely generated group Γ, the **profinite topology** on Γ is given by declaring the finite index subgroups to be a neighborhood basis for the identity element. Alternatively, the profinite topology is the weak topology on the set of all homomorphisms to finite groups where the finite groups are equipped with the discrete topology. In this topology, separation axioms from point-set topology give rise to well-known properties like residual finiteness, which equates to Γ being Hausdorff and normal (i.e., T_4) in the profinite topology. If Γ is finitely presented, separability properties on Γ also give solutions to various decision problems like the word, conjugacy, and generalized word problems. Effective proofs of separability properties give estimates on the difficulty of solving these various decision problems. Moreover, when the groups under consideration are fundamental groups of manifolds, Scott's criterion [26] demonstrates that effective separability proofs can provide valuable topological and geometric information about finite covers of the manifolds. Recently, several effective versions of separability results have been established; see [3], [4], [5], [6], [7] [9], [10], [13], [14], [15], [16], [21], [22], [23], [24], and [27].

Just as the profinite topology is derived from the representation theory of Γ to finite groups, the finite dimensional representations of Γ can be used to produce similar topological structures on Γ. Given an algebraically closed field Ω, a finite dimensional Ω–vector space V, and a homomorphism $\rho\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$, we have the subspace topology on $\rho(\Gamma)$ coming from the Zariski topology on $\mathrm{GL}(V) < \mathrm{End}(V)$. The pullback of this topology to Γ under ρ is called the **Zariski topology associated to** ρ.

One of the primary goals of this article is to provide direct connections between the profinite and Zariski views. One early foundational connection was established by Mal'cev [18] who proved that if $\rho\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ is injective (i.e., Γ is linear), then Γ is residually finite. To separate the identity element, Mal'cev only used the Zariski topology associated to ρ which can be strictly coarser than the full profinite topology; when ρ is not faithful, the associated Zariski topology is never T_1. The explicit description of the Zariski topology also allows for effective versions of residual finiteness (see [7]). Though representation theory has been a useful tool in tackling effective residual problems, it has until now, not been used to obtain effective proofs of subgroup separability.

We say Γ is **subgroup separable** if every finitely generated subgroup is closed in the profinite topology. If a finitely generated subgroup Δ_0 is closed and $\gamma \notin \Delta_0$, then there is a homomorphism

$\varphi\colon \Gamma \to Q$ such that $|Q| < \infty$ and $\varphi(\gamma) \notin \varphi(\Delta_0)$. Letting $\Lambda = \Delta_0 \cdot \ker(\varphi) < \Gamma$, we see that Λ is a finite index subgroup of Γ of index at most $|Q|$ with $\Delta_0 \leq \Lambda$ and $\gamma \notin \Lambda$, recovering the traditional definition of subgroup separability.

Our main result shows that finitely generated subgroups of free and surface groups can be separated in the Zariski topology associated to a representation that depends on the subgroup.

Theorem 1.1 (Zariski Separation)**.** *Let Γ be a finitely generated free group with rank $r > 1$ or the fundamental group of a closed surface Σ_g with genus $g > 1$. If Δ_0 is a finitely generated subgroup of Γ, then there exists a faithful representation $\rho_{\Delta_0}\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ such that $\overline{\rho_{\Delta_0}(\Delta_0)} \cap \rho_{\Delta_0}(\Gamma) = \rho_{\Delta_0}(\Delta_0)$, where $\overline{\rho_{\Delta_0}(\Delta_0)}$ is the Zariski closure of $\rho_{\Delta_0}(\Delta_0)$. In particular, Δ_0 is closed in the Zariski topology associated to ρ_{Δ_0}.*

There are a few different starting points for proving Theorem 1.1 that utilize evaluation maps to distinguish the subgroup Δ_0. Beyond those general methods, the production of the representation in Theorem 1.1 is done by an existence argument that uses the Baire Category Theorem; see Corollary 3.4. Ultraproducts can be used instead of the Baire Category Theorem as well; see Corollary 3.6.

Just as linearity provides a polynomial upper bound for effective residual finiteness, Theorem 1.1 can be used to establish an effective subgroup separability result.

Corollary 1.2 (Polynomial Separability)**.** *Let Γ be a finitely generated free group with rank $r > 1$ or the fundamental group of a closed surface Σ_g with genus $g > 1$. If $\Delta_0 < \Gamma$ is a finitely generated subgroup, then there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that for each $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$, there exists a homomorphism $\varphi\colon \Gamma \to Q$ with $\varphi(\gamma) \notin \varphi(\Delta_0)$ and $|Q| \leq ||\gamma||_{\mathfrak{X}}^D$, where $\mathfrak{X}$ is a finite generating set for Γ and $||\cdot||_{\mathfrak{X}}$ is the associated norm. Letting $\Lambda = \Delta_0 \cdot \ker(\varphi)$, we see that the Λ is a finite index subgroup of Γ, of index at most $|Q| \leq ||\gamma||_{\mathfrak{X}}^D$, such that $\Delta_0 \leq \Lambda$ and $\gamma \notin \Lambda$. Moreover, the normal core of the subgroup Λ that separates Δ_0 from γ is bounded above by $|Q|$.*

Deducing Corollary 1.2 from Theorem 1.1 is straightforward and uses methods from [7]. The constant D explicitly depends on the subgroup Δ_0 and and the dimension of V in Theorem 1.1. For a general finite index subgroup, the crude upper bound for the index of the normal core is factorial in the index of the subgroup. It is for this reason that we include the statement regarding the normal core of Λ at the end of Corollary 1.2.

There are existing bounds on the index of the separating subgroups for free and surface groups given by the third author [21], and M.F. Hagen and the third author [10]. We will compare the bounds of Corollary 1.2 to the results in [21] and [10] in Section 6. We note that it is unlikely that Corollary 1.2 holds for a constant independent of Δ_0; see also Section 6 for more details.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Khalid Bou-Rabee, Mark Hagen, Feng Luo, and Alan Reid for conversations on the work presented here. The second author was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1105710 and DMS-1408458.

2. Preliminaries

Complex algebraic groups. We refer the reader to [2] for an introduction to algebraic groups. Given a complex affine algebraic group $\mathbf{G} < \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{C})$, there exist polynomials $Q_1, \ldots, Q_r \in \mathbf{C}[X_{i,j}]$ such that

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}) = V(Q_1, \ldots, Q_r) = \left\{ X \in \mathbf{C}^{n^2} \ : \ Q_k(X) = 0,\ k = 1, \ldots, r \right\}.$$

We refer to the polynomials $Q_1,\dots,Q_r$ as **defining polynomials** for $\mathbf{G}$. We will say that $\mathbf{G}$ is K**–defined** for a subfield $K\subset\mathbf{C}$ if there exists defining polynomials $Q_1,\dots,Q_r\in K[X_{i,j}]$ for $\mathbf{G}$. For a complex affine algebraic subgroup $\mathbf{H}<\mathbf{G}<\mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbf{C})$, we will pick the defining polynomials for $\mathbf{H}$ to contain a defining set for $\mathbf{G}$ as a subset. Specifically, we have polynomials $Q_1,\dots,Q_{r_\mathbf{G}},Q_{r_\mathbf{G}+1},\dots,Q_{r_\mathbf{H}}\in\mathbf{C}[X_{i,j}]$ such that

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{C})=V(Q_1,\dots,Q_{r_\mathbf{H}}),\quad \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})=V(Q_1,\dots,Q_{r_\mathbf{G}}). \tag{1}$$

If $\mathbf{G}$ is defined over a number field K with associated ring of integers $\mathscr{O}_K$, we can find polynomials $Q_1,\dots,Q_r\in\mathscr{O}_K[X_{i,j}]$ as a defining set by clearing denominators. In the case when $K=\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathscr{O}_K=\mathbf{Z}$, these are multivariable integer polynomials.

Spaces of representations. For a fixed finite set $\mathfrak{X}=\{x_j\}_{j=1}^t$ with associated free group $F(\mathfrak{X})$ and any group G, the set of homomorphisms from $F(\mathfrak{X})$ to G, denoted by $\mathrm{Hom}(F(\mathfrak{X}),G)$, can be identified with G^t. For any point $(g_1,\dots,g_t)\in G^t$, we have an associated homomorphism $\varphi_{(g_1,\dots,g_t)}\colon F(\mathfrak{X})\to G$ given by $\varphi_{(g_1,\dots,g_t)}(x_i)=g_i$. For any word $w\in F(\mathfrak{X})$, we have a function $\mathrm{Eval}_w\colon \mathrm{Hom}(F(\mathfrak{X}),G)\to G$ defined by

$$\mathrm{Eval}_w(\varphi_{(g_1,\dots,g_t)})=\varphi_{(g_1,\dots,g_t)}(w)=w(g_1,\dots,g_t).$$

The function Eval_w is sometimes referred to as a **word map**.

For a finitely presented group Γ, we fix a finite presentation $\langle\mathfrak{X};\mathfrak{R}\rangle$ where $\mathfrak{X}=\{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_t\}$ is a generating set (as a monoid) and $\mathfrak{R}=\{r_1,\dots,r_{t'}\}$ is a finite set of relations. If $\mathbf{G}$ is a complex affine algebraic subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbf{C})$, the set $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ of homomorphisms $\rho\colon\Gamma\to\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ can be identified with an affine algebraic subvarieity of $(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))^t$. Specifically

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})=\left\{(g_1,\dots,g_t)\in(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))^t\ :\ r_j(g_1,\dots,g_t)=I_n \text{ for all } j\right\}. \tag{2}$$

$\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ can be topologized with the subspace topology induced by the analytic topology on $(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))^t$ as well. In this topology, there is a Zariski open subset of $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ that is smooth and the functions $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma\colon \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})\to\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ are analytic. For any subgroup subset $S\subset\Gamma$ and representation $\rho\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$, $\overline{\rho(S)}$ will denote the Zariski closure of $\rho(S)$ in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$.

Separability functions and complexity. For a finitely generated group Γ with a fixed finite generating set $\mathfrak{X}$, we denote the associated norm by $||\cdot||_\mathfrak{X}$. Given a subgroup $\Delta_0<\Gamma$ and $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$, we define

$$\mathrm{D}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,\gamma)=\min\{[\Gamma:\Lambda]\ :\ \Delta_0<\Lambda,\ \gamma\notin\Lambda\}.$$

When Δ_0 is separable in Γ, $\mathrm{D}(\Delta_0,\gamma)<\infty$ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. The maximal value of $\mathrm{D}(\Delta_0,\gamma)$ ranging over all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$ with $||\gamma||_\mathfrak{X}\le m$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{Sep}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,m)$. Note that in [10], $\mathrm{D}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,\gamma)$ and $\mathbf{Sep}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,m)$ are denoted by $D_\Gamma^{\Omega_{\Delta_0}}(\gamma)$ and $\mathbf{Sep}_{\Gamma,\mathfrak{X}}(\Delta_0,m)$, respectively.

Recall that for a pair of functions $f_1,f_2\colon\mathbf{N}\to\mathbf{N}$, we say $f_1\preceq f_2$ if there exists a constant $C>0$ such that $f_1(m)\le Cf_2(Cm)$ for all m. When $f_1\preceq f_2$ and $f_2\preceq f_1$, we write $f_1\approx f_2$. The function $\mathbf{Sep}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,m)$ above depends on the choice of the generating set $\mathfrak{X}$. However, it is straightforward to see verify that $\mathbf{Sep}_{\Gamma,\mathfrak{X}}(\Delta_0,m)\approx\mathbf{Sep}_{\Gamma,\mathfrak{X}'}(\Delta_0,m)$ holds for any finite generating sets $\mathfrak{X},\mathfrak{X}'$ of Γ. We will suppress any dependence of the function $\mathbf{Sep}_\Gamma(\Delta_0,m)$ on the generating set $\mathfrak{X}$.

3. Evaluation maps

Throughout this section, Γ will be a finitely presented group and Δ_0 a finitely generated subgroup of Γ. For a complex affine algebraic group $\mathbf{G}$ and any representation $\rho_0\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$, we have the subset

$$\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})=\{\rho\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})\ :\ \rho_0(\delta)=\rho(\delta)\text{ for all }\delta\in\Delta_0\}.$$

Note that since Δ_0 is finitely generated, $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ is a closed affine subvariety of $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$. Indeed, fixing a finite generating set $\{\delta_1,\dots,\delta_t\}$ for Δ_0, we obtain t systems of equations from the equalities $\rho_0(\delta_j)=\rho(\delta_j)$ as we range over $1\leq j\leq t$. As solving those t systems of equations is necessary and sufficient for membership in $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ (assuming it is a representation of Γ which is also described by a finite set of algebraic equations), we see that $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ is a closed subvariety. Additionally, for each $\gamma\in\Gamma$, the restriction of Eval_γ to $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\Delta)$ is an algebraic function and hence also an analytic function.

We say that ρ_0 **distinguishes** Δ_0 from γ if the restriction of Eval_γ to $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\Delta)$ is non-constant. We say that ρ_0 **weakly distinguishes** Δ_0 in Γ, if ρ_0 distinguishes Δ_0 from γ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. We say that ρ_0 **distinguishes** Δ_0 in Γ if for each finite set $S\subset\Gamma-\Delta_0$, there are $\rho,\rho'\in\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho)\neq\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho')$ for all $\gamma\in S$. Finally, we say that ρ_0 **strongly distinguishes** Δ_0 in Γ if there are $\rho,\rho'\in\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho)\neq\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho')$ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Γ be a finitely presented group, $\mathbf{G}$ is a complex algebraic group, and Δ_0 a finitely generated subgroup of Γ that is strongly distinguished by a representation $\rho_0\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$. Then there exists a representation $\Phi\colon\Gamma\to\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\Phi(\Gamma)\cap\overline{\Phi(\Delta_0)}=\Phi(\Delta_0)$, where $\overline{\Phi(\Delta_0)}$ is the Zariski closure of $\Phi(\Delta_0)$ in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$.*

Proof. By definition, there are representations $\rho,\rho'\in\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho)\neq\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho')$ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. Take $\Phi\colon\Gamma\to\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ given by $\Phi=\rho\times\rho'$. By construction, we see that $\Phi(\Delta_0)<\mathrm{Diag}(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))$ and $\Phi(\gamma)\notin\mathrm{Diag}(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))$ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. In particular, $\overline{\Phi(\Delta_0)}<\mathrm{Diag}(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))$ since $\mathrm{Diag}(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}))$ is Zariski closed. Hence, $\Phi(\Delta_0)=\overline{\Phi(\Delta_0)}\cap\Phi(\Gamma)$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a finitely presented group, $\mathbf{G}$ is a complex algebraic group, and Δ_0 a finitely generated subgroup of Γ that is distinguished by a representation $\rho_0\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$. Then ρ_0 strongly distinguishes Δ_0.*

Proof. To find the representations ρ,ρ', we proceed as follows. First, we set

$$\mathscr{R}=\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})\times\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$$

and let $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}\colon\mathscr{R}\to\mathbf{G}$ be given by $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}(\rho,\rho')=\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho)(\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho'))^{-1}$. By assumption, for any finite set $S\subset\Gamma-\Delta_0$, there exists $(\rho_S,\rho_S')\in\mathscr{R}$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}(\rho_S,\rho_S')\neq I_n$ for all $\gamma\in S$. Fixing an ordering $\{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\dots\}$ of $\Gamma-\Delta_0$ and taking $S_j=\{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\dots,\gamma_j\}$ for S in the above, we obtain a sequence of pairs $\{(\rho_j,\rho_j')\}\subset\mathscr{R}$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}(\rho_j,\rho_j')\neq I_n$ for all $\gamma\in S_j$. As $\mathscr{R}$ has only finitely many connected/irreducible components, there is a subsequence of $\{(\rho_j,\rho_j')\}$ that resides in a fixed connected/irreducible component. Let $\mathscr{R}_0$ be such a component and note that if $\mathscr{R}_0$ is a single point, then that point (ρ,ρ') is the desired pair. Otherwise, we know $\dim\mathscr{R}_0>0$, and by selection of $\mathscr{R}_0$, the analytic function $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}$ is non-constant for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. Consequently, the set $\mathscr{B}_\gamma=\left\{(\rho,\rho')\in\mathscr{R}_0\ :\ \mathrm{Eval}_\gamma^{(2)}=I_n\right\}$ is nowhere dense in $\mathscr{R}_0$ for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. By the Baire Category Theorem, we know that the set $\mathscr{B}_{\Delta_0}=\bigcup_{\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0}\mathscr{B}_\gamma$ is nowhere dense. In particular, $\mathscr{R}_0-\mathscr{B}_{\Delta_0}\neq\emptyset$ and any $(\rho,\rho')\in\mathscr{R}_0-\mathscr{B}_{\Delta_0}$ suffices for the claim. □

If Δ_0 is only weakly distinguished by ρ_0, it is unclear how to guarantee that there is a connected/irreducible component of $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ where Eval_γ is non-constant for all $\gamma\in\Gamma-\Delta_0$. However, if $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ is connected/irreducible, the above argument yields the following.

Scholium 3.3. *Let Γ be a finitely presented group, $\mathbf{G}$ is a complex algebraic group, and Δ_0 a finitely generated subgroup of Γ that is weakly distinguished by a representation $\rho_0\in\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$. If $\mathscr{R}_{\rho_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma,\mathbf{G})$ is connected, then ρ_0 strongly distinguishes Δ_0.*

We have the following immediate corollary of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2

Corollary 3.4. *Let Γ be a finitely presented group, $\mathbf{G}$ is a complex algebraic group, and Δ_0 a finitely generated subgroup of Γ that is distinguished by a representation $\rho_0 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbf{G})$. Then there exists a representation $\rho\colon \Gamma \to \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\rho(\Gamma) \cap \overline{\rho(\Delta_0)} = \rho(\Delta_0)$, where $\overline{\rho(\Delta_0)}$ is the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Delta_0)$ in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$.*

3.1. **Twisting by automorphisms.** Given an automorphism $\psi_0 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, we can define

$$\mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma) = \left\{ \psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) \ : \ \psi_{|\Delta_0} = (\psi_0)_{|\Delta_0} \right\}.$$

For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have the function $\mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}\colon \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) \to \Gamma$ defined by $\mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}(\psi) = \psi(\gamma)$. We say that Δ_0 is **weakly ψ_0–distinguished in** Γ if $\mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}$ is non-constant on $\mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$. We say that Δ_0 is **ψ_0–distinguished** if for any finite set S of $\Gamma - \Delta_0$, there are automorphisms $\psi_S, \psi'_S \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}(\psi_S) \neq \mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}(\psi'_S)$ for all $\gamma \in S$. Finally, we say Δ_0 is **strongly ψ_0–distinguished** if there exist $\psi, \psi' \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\psi) \neq \mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\psi')$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$.

Lemma 3.5. *If Γ is a finitely presented group and Δ_0 is (weakly, strongly) ψ_0–distinguished in Γ, then for any complex algebraic group $\mathbf{G}$ and any injective representation $\rho \in \mathscr{R}(\Gamma, \mathbf{G})$, Δ_0 is (weakly, strongly) distinguished by $\rho \circ \psi_0$ in Γ.*

Proof. To begin, note that for any $\psi, \psi' \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma)$ and any $\rho \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbf{G})$, we have

$$(\rho \circ \psi)_{|\Delta_0} = (\rho \circ \psi')_{|\Delta_0}.$$

For any $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$, there exists $\psi, \psi' \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}(\psi) \neq \mathrm{Eval}_{\mathrm{Aut},\gamma}(\psi')$ since Δ_0 is weakly ψ_0–distinguished. As ρ is injective, we know that $\rho(\psi(\gamma)) \neq \rho(\psi'(\gamma))$ and so $\mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho \circ \psi) \neq \mathrm{Eval}_\gamma(\rho \circ \psi')$. By definition, $\rho \circ \psi, \rho \circ \psi' \in \mathscr{R}_{\rho\circ\psi_0,\Delta_0}(\Gamma, \mathbf{G})$ and so Δ_0 is weakly distinguished by $\rho \circ \psi_0$. The proof when Δ_0 is ψ_0–distinguished or strongly ψ_0–distinguished is identical. □

3.2. **Finite fields and ultraproducts.** In this subsection, we give an alternative to Corollary 3.4 that makes use of ultrafilters and ultraproducts (see [11] for background on using ultraproducts in representation theory). Briefly, the approach is to work instead with representations to finite groups of Lie type over finite fields. In fact, we will consider only representations to finite groups of the form $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{F}_q)$ for a fixed n and varying finite fields $\mathbf{F}_q$.

We say that a finitely generated group Γ is **fully residually** GL_n **relative to** Δ_0 if for any finite set $S \subset \Gamma - \Delta_0$, there is a homomorphism $\varphi\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{F}_q)$ for some finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$ such that $\varphi(\gamma) \neq 1$ for every $\gamma \in S$. When Δ_0 is the trivial subgroup, we say that Γ is **fully residually** GL_n.

Corollary 3.6. *Let Γ be a finitely generated group that is fully residually GL_n relative to Δ_0 for some n and Δ_0 a ψ_0–distinguished subgroup for some automorphism $\psi_0 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Then there exists a representation $\rho_\omega\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, \Omega) \times \mathrm{GL}(n, \Omega)$ such that $\rho_\omega(\Delta_0) = \overline{\rho_\omega(\Delta_0)} \cap \rho_\omega(\Gamma)$, where Ω is an algebraically closed field.*

Proof. We begin by ordering $\{\gamma_j\} = \Gamma - \Delta_0$. For each $j \in \mathbf{N}$, since Δ_0 is strongly ψ_0–distinguished, there are automorphisms $\psi_j, \psi'_j \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0}(\Gamma, \Delta_0)$ such that $\psi_j(\gamma_i) \neq \psi'_j(\gamma_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j$. Setting $\theta_{i,j} = (\psi_j(\gamma_i))^{-1}\psi'_j(\gamma_i)$, and $S_j = \{\theta_{i,j}\}_{i=1}^j$, there exists a homomorphism $\varphi_j\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{F}_{q_j})$ such that $\varphi_j(\theta_i) \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j$, as Γ is residually GL_n. In particular, for the representation $\Phi_j = (\varphi_j \circ \psi_j) \times (\varphi_j \times \psi'_j)$, we see that $\Phi_j(\Delta_0) < \mathrm{Diag}(n, \mathbf{F}_{q_j})$. However, for each $1 \leq i \leq j$, the

image of γ_i under $\Phi_j(\gamma_i) \notin \mathrm{Diag}(n, \mathbf{F}_{q_j})$. Taking a non-principal ultrafilter ω on $\mathbf{N}$, we have the associated ultraproduct $K_\omega = \prod_\omega \mathbf{F}_{q_j}$ and representation $\rho_\omega \colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, K_\omega) \times \mathrm{GL}(n, K_\omega)$. By Łoš's Theorem, K_ω is a field. Moreover, by construction of ρ_ω, the image of $\rho_\omega(\Delta_0) < \mathrm{Diag}(n, K_\omega)$, and so after fixing an algebraic closure Ω of K_ω, we see that the Zariski closure of $\rho_\omega(\Delta_0)$ is contained in $\mathrm{Diag}(n, \Omega)$. However, since $\Phi_j(\gamma_i) \notin \mathrm{Diag}(n, \mathbf{F}_{q_j})$ for all $j \geq i$, we must have $\rho_\omega(\gamma_i) \notin \mathrm{Diag}(n, \Omega)$ for all $i \geq 1$. In particular, $\overline{\rho_\omega(\Delta_0)} \cap \rho_\omega(\Gamma) = \rho_\omega(\Delta_0)$. □

If we had a representation $\rho \colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, \Omega) \times \mathrm{GL}(n, \Omega)$ such that $\rho(\Delta_0) < \mathrm{Diag}(n, \Omega)$ and $\rho(\gamma) \notin \mathrm{Diag}(n, \Omega)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$, the maps Φ_j with the properties used in the proof of Corollary 3.6 exist. Given the maps Φ_j, the ultraproduct representation ρ_ω essentially reassembles the representation ρ.

Remark 1. *The reader should note that if there exists a representation ρ_{Δ_0} for Γ that satisfies the conclusions of Corollary 3.6, then Γ is residually GL_{2n} relative to Δ_0. In particular, our residual assumption in Corollary 3.6 is necessary.*

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we show that particular subgroups of free and surface groups are distinguished by a special set of representations and automorphisms.

4.1. **Free and surface group automorphisms.** Given a finitely generated free group $\Lambda = \Delta_0 * \Delta$ and any automorphism ψ_0 on Δ_0, we can extend ψ_0 to an automorphism of Λ.

Lemma 4.1. *If Λ is a finitely generated free group with a free factor decomposition $\Lambda = \Delta_0 * \Delta$, then Δ_0 is strongly ψ_0–distinguished, where ψ_0 is the identity.*

Proof. If $\Lambda = \Delta_0$ then the statement holds trivially. Fix free generating sets $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_t\}$ and $\{\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_s\}$ for Δ_0 and Δ, respectively. It suffices to show that there exists an automorphism $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0, \Delta_0}(\Lambda)$ such that $\psi(\gamma) \neq \psi_0(\gamma) = \gamma$, for all $\gamma \in \Lambda - \Delta_0$. To that end, let $\psi \colon \Lambda \to \Lambda$ be given by $\psi(\delta_i) = \delta_i$ and $\psi(\kappa_j) = \delta_1 \cdot \kappa_j \cdot \delta_1^{-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$ and $j = 1, \ldots, s$. By definition of ψ, we see that $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0, \Delta_0}(\Lambda)$, and that $\psi(\lambda) = \delta_1 \cdot \lambda \delta_1^{-1}$ for all $\lambda \in \Delta$. It remains to verify that $\psi(\gamma) \neq \gamma$ for every $\gamma \in \Lambda - \Delta_0$. Given $\gamma \in \Lambda - \Delta_0$, we have a reduced expression $\gamma = \mu_1 \lambda_1 \cdots \mu_m \lambda_m$, where $m \geq 1$, $\mu_i \in \Delta_0 - \{1\}$, and $\lambda_i \in \Delta - \{1\}$, with the exception that μ_1 or λ_m could be trivial. Thus,

$$\psi(\gamma) = \psi(\mu_1 \lambda_1 \cdots \mu_m \lambda_m) = (\mu_1 \delta_1) \lambda_1 (\delta_1^{-1} \mu_2 \delta_1) \cdots (\delta_1^{-1} \mu_m \delta_1) \lambda_m (\delta_1^{-1}) = \mu_1' \lambda_1 \mu_2' \cdots \mu_m' \lambda_m \delta_1^{-1},$$

where $\mu_i \neq \mu_i'$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Thus, $\psi(\gamma) \neq \gamma$ for all $\gamma \in \Lambda - \Delta_0$.

□

Lemma 4.2. *If Σ_g is a closed surface of genus $g > 1$ and Σ' is a compact, embedded, incompressible subsurface, then $\pi_1(\Sigma', p)$ is strongly ψ_0–distinguished in $\pi_1(\Sigma_g, p)$, where ψ_0 is the identity.*

Proof. If $\pi_1(\Sigma_g) = \pi_1(\Sigma')$ the statement holds trivially. Thus, assume that $\pi_1(\Sigma') < \pi_1(\Sigma_g)$. Our goal is to produce $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0}(\pi_1(\Sigma_g), \pi_1(\Sigma'))$ such that $\psi([\gamma]) \neq \psi_0([\gamma]) = [\gamma]$ for all $[\gamma] \in \pi_1(\Sigma_g) - \pi_1(\Sigma')$. We fix the basepoint p of $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)$ in the interior of Σ', away from the boundary components $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_b$ of Σ'. Then for $[\gamma] \in \pi_1(\Sigma_g, p) - \pi_1(\Sigma', p)$, any loop representing $[\gamma]$ must cross at least one boundary component of Σ'. Let $\tau_i : \Sigma_g \to \Sigma_g$ be the homeomorphism of Σ_g given by a Dehn twist about α_i for $i = 1, \ldots, b$. Then each τ_i induces an automorphism $\psi_i \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\psi_0}(\pi_1(\Sigma_g, p), \pi_1(\Sigma', p))$ defined by $\psi_i([\gamma]) = [\tau_i(\gamma)]$. For any $[\gamma] \in \pi_1(\Sigma_g) - \pi_1(\Sigma')$ such

that γ crosses α_i, we see that $\psi_i([\gamma]) \neq [\gamma]$. Letting $\psi = \psi_b \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1$, we have the desired automorphism.

□

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let Γ be either a free group of rank $r > 1$ or the fundamental group of a closed surface Σ_g of genus $g > 1$. Given a finitely generated subgroup Δ_0, if Γ is free, then by work of Hall [12], there exists a finite index subgroup $\Lambda < \Gamma$ with $\Lambda = \Delta_0 * \Delta$. If Γ is the fundamental group of a closed surface, then there is a finite cover $P\colon \Sigma_{g_0} \to \Sigma_g$ such that $\Delta_0 < P_*(\pi_1(\Sigma_{g_0})) = \Lambda$ by work of Scott [26]. Moreover, there exists a embedded compact subsurface Σ_{Δ_0} of Σ_{g_0} with $\Delta_0 = \pi_1(\Sigma_{\Delta_0})$. In either case, we can apply Lemma 4.1 or Lemma 4.2 to see that Δ_0 is strongly ψ_0–distinguished in Λ. For any faithful representation $\rho_0 \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbf{C}))$, ρ_0 strongly distinguishes Δ_0 by Lemma 3.5. By Corollary 3.4, we have $\Phi\colon \Lambda \to \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbf{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbf{C})$ such that $\Phi(\gamma) \in \mathrm{Diag}(\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbf{C}))$ if and only if $\gamma \in \Delta_0$. Setting $d_{\Delta_0} = [\Gamma : \Lambda]$, we have the induced representation $\mathrm{Ind}_\Lambda^\Gamma(\Phi)\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(2d_{\Delta_0},\mathbf{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}(2d_{\Delta_0},\mathbf{C})$. Taking $\rho = \mathrm{Ind}_\Lambda^\Gamma(\Phi)$, it follows by the construction of ρ_0 and from the definition of induction that, $\rho(\gamma) \in \overline{\rho(\Delta_0)}$ if and only if $\gamma \in \Delta_0$. In particular, $\rho(\Delta_0) = \rho(\Gamma) \cap \overline{\rho(\Delta_0)}$ as needed, and ρ is faithful since ρ_0 is faithful.

5. Proof of Corollary 1.2

The following basic result has been proven in [1], [19], and [20].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathbf{G} < \mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbf{C})$ be a $\mathbf{Q}$–algebraic group, $\mathbf{H} < \mathbf{G}$ a $\mathbf{Q}$–algebraic subgroup, $\Gamma < \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ a finitely generated subgroup, and $\Delta_0 = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{C}) \cap \Gamma$. Then Δ_0 is subgroup separable in Γ.*

We include a proof here as we will need it in the proof of Corollary 1.2.

Proof. Given $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$, we must find a homomorphism $\varphi\colon \Gamma \to Q$ with $|Q| < \infty$ and $\varphi(\gamma) \notin \varphi(\Delta)$. To that end, we first select polynomials $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{r_\mathbf{G}}, \ldots, Q_{r_\mathbf{H}} \in \mathbf{C}[X_{i,j}]$ satisfying (1) from Section 2. Since $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}$ are $\mathbf{Q}$–defined, we can select the Q_j above to reside in $\mathbf{Z}[X_{i,j}]$ after clearing denominators. For the finitely generated subgroup $\Gamma < \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$, we fix a finite set $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{r_\Gamma}\}$ that generates Γ as a monoid. In order to distinguish between the elements of Γ as an abstract group versus the explicit elements in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$, we set $\gamma = A_\gamma \in \mathbf{G}$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$. In particular, we have a representation $\rho_0\colon \Gamma \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{C})$ given by $\rho_0(\gamma_t) = A_{\gamma_t}$. We set K_Γ to be the field generated over $\mathbf{Q}$ by the set of matrix entries $\left\{(A_{\gamma_t})_{i,j}\right\}_{t,i,j}$. It is straightforward to see that K_Γ is independent of the choice of the generating set for Γ. The field K_Γ has finite transcendence degree over $\mathbf{Q}$ and so K_Γ is isomorphic to a field of the form $K(T)$ where $K/\mathbf{Q}$ is a number field and $T = \{T_1, \ldots, T_d\}$ is a transcendental basis (see [25, Cor. 3.3.3]). For each A_{γ_t}, we have $(A_{\gamma_t})_{i,j} = F_{i,j,t}(T)$. In particular, we can view the (i,j)–entry of the matrix A_{γ_t} as a rational function in d variables with coefficients in some number field K. Selecting a $\mathbf{Q}(T)$–basis for K_Γ, we have an embedding $\mathrm{Res}_{K_\Gamma/\mathbf{Q}(T)}$ of K_Γ into $\mathrm{Mat}(d_0, \mathbf{Q}(T))$ where d_0 is the degree of the extension $K_\Gamma/\mathbf{Q}(T)$. Applying this embedding to the coefficients of $\mathrm{GL}(N, K_\Gamma)$, we can assume that $K_\Gamma = \mathbf{Q}(T)$. Note that

$$\mathrm{Res}_{K_\Gamma/\mathbf{Q}(T)}(\mathbf{H})(\mathbf{C}) \cong (\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{C}))^{d_0} < \mathrm{Res}_{K_\Gamma/\mathbf{Q}(T)}(\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{C}) \cong (\mathbf{G}(C))^{d_0} < \mathrm{GL}(d_0 n, \mathbf{C})$$

as $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}$ are $\mathbf{Q}$–defined.

Taking the ring R_Γ generated over $\mathbf{Z}$ by the set $\left\{(A_{\gamma_t})_{i,j}\right\}_{t,i,j}$, we see that R_Γ is obtained from $\mathbf{Z}[T_1, \ldots, T_d]$ by inverting a finite number of integers and polynomials. Moreover, any ring homomorphism $R_\Gamma \to R$ induces a group homomorphism $\mathrm{GL}(n, R_\Gamma) \to \mathrm{GL}(n, R)$. As $\Gamma < \mathrm{GL}(n, R_\Gamma)$, we obtain a homomorphism $\Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, R)$.

If $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Delta_0$, then we know there must by some $r_{\mathbf{G}} < j_\gamma \leq r_{\mathbf{H}}$ such that

$$P_\gamma = Q_{j_\gamma}((A_\gamma)_{1,1}, \ldots, (A_\gamma)_{n,n}) \neq 0.$$

As Q_{j_γ} is in $\mathbf{Z}[X_{i,j}]$ and each of the $(A_\gamma)_{i,j}$ are in R_Γ, we see that P_γ is also in R_Γ. Using Lemma 2.1 in [7], we can find a ring homomorphism $\psi_R \colon R_\Gamma \to R$ with $|R| < \infty$ such that $\psi_R(P_\gamma) \neq 0$. Setting $\rho_R \colon \mathrm{GL}(n, R_\Gamma) \to \mathrm{GL}(n, R)$, we assert that $\rho_R(\gamma) \notin \rho_R(\Delta_0)$. For each $\eta \in \Gamma$, set $\overline{A}_\eta = \rho_R(\eta)$ and note that

$$\psi_R(Q_j((A_\eta)_{1,1}, \ldots, (A_\eta)_{n,n})) = Q_j((\overline{A}_\eta)_{1,1}, \ldots, (\overline{A}_\eta)_{n,n}).$$

For each $\delta \in \Delta_0$, we know that $Q_{j_\gamma}((A_\delta)_{i,j}) = 0$ and so

$$Q_j((\overline{A}_\eta)_{1,1}, \ldots, (\overline{A}_\eta)_{n,n}) = 0. \tag{3}$$

However, by selection of φ_R, we know that $\varphi_R(P_\gamma) \neq 0$ and so γ cannot satifiy (3). In particular, we see that $\rho_R(\gamma) \notin \rho_R(\Delta_0)$. □

5.1. **Proof of Corollary 1.2.** To prove Corollary 1.2, we will combine Theorem 1.1 with Lemma 5.1. By Theorem 1.1, there exists a representation $\rho \colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{C})$ such that if we set $\mathbf{G} = \overline{\rho(\Gamma)}$ and $\mathbf{H} = \overline{\rho(\Delta_0)}$, then $\rho(\Delta_0) = \rho(\Gamma) \cap \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{C})$. In particular, by Lemma 5.1, Δ_0 is separable in Γ. In order to make Lemma 5.1 effective we need to bound the order of the ring R in terms of the word length of the element γ in the proof of Lemma 5.1. Lemma 2.1 from [7] bounds the size of R in terms of the coefficient size and degree of the polynomial P_γ. It follows from the discussion on p. 412–413 that the coefficients and degree can be bounded in terms of the word length of γ, and the coefficients and degrees of the polynomials Q_j. As the functions Q_j are fixed and hence independent of the word γ, we see that there exists a constant D_0 such that $|R| \leq ||\gamma||^{D_0}$. By construction, the group Q needed in Corollary 1.2 for γ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(n, R)$ and so $|Q| \leq |R|^{n^2} \leq ||\gamma||^{D_0 n^2}$. Hence, we can take $D = D_0 n^2$.

Remark 2. *In the case of surface groups $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)$, we assumed that $g > 1$, and in the case of a free group F_r, we assumed $r > 1$. Theorem 1.1 also holds in case $g = 1$ or $r = 1$, where we have $\pi_1(\Sigma_1) = \mathbf{Z}^2$ or $F_1 = \mathbf{Z}$. Corollary 1.2 also holds but with a stronger upper bound on the order of* $\log ||\gamma||$. *These assertions follow fairly easily from* [3].

6. Final Remarks

The main contribution of Corollary 1.2 is that we provide polynomial bounds on the size of the normal core of the finite index subgroup Λ used in the separation of γ from Δ_0. The methods employed in [10] give linear bounds in terms of the word length of γ on the index of the subgroup used in the separation but do not easily produce polynomial bounds for the normal core of that finite index subgroup. With care taken to make our argument optimal, we can obtain bounds on the index of the separating subgroup on the order of magnitude $C||\gamma||$ as well.

In the first step in proving Theorem 1.1, we passed to a finite index subgroup where our subgroup Δ_0 is either a free factor or is the fundamental group of an embedded subsurface in the cover corresponding to the finite index subgroup. We can use [21] to estimate the index of this finite index subgroup, and that number only depends on the number of generators of Δ_0 and their word lengths. It controls the degree of the polynomial upper bound/dimension of the representation and also controls the constant C in estimate for the index of the separating subgroup. As the number of generators of Δ_0 alone can arbitrarily large and we believe these methods are of the same rough order as the optimal one, it seems unlikely that there should be a uniform upper bound on the dimensions of these representations. Specifically, we believe the following.

Conjecture 6.1. *Let Ω be a fixed algebraically closed field and $\mathscr{R}_n(\Gamma,\Omega)$ be the set of representations $\rho\colon \Gamma \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ where V is an n–dimensional Ω–vector space. If Γ is a free or surface group, then there exists a finitely generated subgroup Δ that is not closed in the Zariski topology associated to ρ for any $\rho \in \mathscr{R}_n(\Gamma,\Omega)$.*

For conjugacy separability, traces can be used to distinguish conjugacy classes in the Zariski topology. Wehrfritz [28] established the conjugacy version of Theorem 1.1 for free groups (see Theorem 1.6 in [16] for the case of surface groups). Effective bounds in the same spirit established here are also established for conjugacy separability in [16] via the same reduction methods. Additionally, Conjecture 1 in [16] is the conjugacy version of Conjecture 6.1.

Finally, to what extent Theorem 1.1 can be generalized to other classes of groups is unclear. We make specific use of our settings in this article but believe that the broad framework we present should work for a larger class of groups. That prompts the following question:

Question: *Does Theorem 1.1 hold when Γ is the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic 3–manifold and Δ_0 is a finitely generated, geometrically finite subgroup? Does Theorem 1.1 hold when Γ is a right-angled Artin group and Δ_0 is a quasi-convex subgroup?*

By [10], separability of these subgroups can be done with finite index subgroups of polynomial index in $||\gamma||$. That is a necessary condition in order for Theorem 1.1 to hold. In the settings for the above question, we optimistically believe that this condition is also sufficient, but there is admittedly little evidence to conjecture it.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Bergeron, *Premier nombre de Betti et spectre du laplacien de certaines variétés hyperboliques*, Enseign. Math. **46** (2000) 109–137.

[2] A. Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[3] K. Bou-Rabee, *Quantifying residual finiteness*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), 729–737.

[4] K. Bou-Rabee, M. F. Hagen, P. Patel, *Residual Finiteness Growths of Virtually Special Groups*, Math. Z. **279** (2015), 297–310.

[5] K. Bou-Rabee, T. Kaletha, *Quantifying residual finiteness of arithmetic groups*, Compos. Math. **148** (2012), 907–920.

[6] K. Bou-Rabee, D. B. McReynolds, *Asymptotic growth and least common multiples in groups*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **43** (2011), 1059–1068.

[7] K. Bou-Rabee, D. B. McReynolds, *Extremal behavior of divisibility functions on linear groups*, Geom. Dedicata. **175** (2015), 407–415.

[8] K. Bou-Rabee, D. B. McReynolds, *Characterizing linear groups in terms of growth properties*, ArXiV.

[9] N. V. Buskin, *Efficient separability in free groups*, Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **50** (2009), 765–771.

[10] M. F. Hagen, P. Patel, *Quantifying separability in virtually special groups*, ArXiV

[11] J. I. Hall, *Locally Finite Simple Groups of Finitary Linear Transformations*, Nato Science Series C **471** (1995), 147–188.

[12] M. Hall, *Coset representations of free groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **67** (1949), 421–432.

[13] M. Kassabov, F. Matucci, *Bounding the residual finiteness of free groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **139** (2011), 2281–2286.

[14] G. Kozma, A. Thom, *Divisibility and laws in finite simple groups*, to appear in Math. Ann.

[15] O. Kharlampovich, A. Myasnikov, M. Sapir, *Algorithmically complex residually finite groups*, ArXiV.

[16] S. Lawton, L. Louder, D. B. McReynolds, *Decision problems, complexity, traces, and representations*, ArXiV

[17] D. D. Long, A. W. Reid, *Subgroup separability and virtual retractions of groups*, Topology **47** (2008), 137–159.

[18] A. I. Mal'cev, *On the faithful representation of infinite groups by matrices*, Mat. Sb. **8** (1940), 405–422.

[19] G. A. Margulis, G A. Soĭfer, *Maximal subgroups of infinite index in finitely generated linear groups*, J. Algebra **69** (1981), 1–23.

[20] D. B. McReynolds, *Peripheral separability and cusps of arithmetic hyperbolic orbifolds*, Algebr. and Geom. Topol. **4** (2004), 721–755.

[21] P. Patel, *On a Theorem of Peter Scott*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **142** (2014), 2891–2906.
[22] P. Patel, *On the Residual Finiteness Growths of Particular Hyperbolic Manifold Groups*, ArXiV
[23] M. Pengitore, *Effective conjugacy separability of finitely generated nilpotent groups*, ArXiV.
[24] I. Rivin, *Geodesics with one self-intersection, and other stories*, Adv. Math. **231** (2012), 2391–2412.
[25] S. Roman, *Field theory*, Springer–Verlag, 1995.
[26] G. P. Scott, *Subgroups of surface groups are almost geometric*, J. London Math. Soc. **17** (1978) 555–565; J. London Math. Soc. **32** (1985) 217–220.
[27] A. Thom, *About the length of laws for finite groups*, ArXiv.
[28] B. A. F. Wehrfritz, *Conjugacy separating representations of free groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **40** (1973), 52–56.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, LONDON, ENGLAND

E-mail address: l.louder@ucl.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN USA

E-mail address: dmcreyno@purdue.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN USA

E-mail address: patel376@purdue.edu